

Imai teaches an apparatus and method for playback of continuous data after writing or pointing to text/image data already prepared or distributed. See col. 19, lines 49-54. The already existing text/image data are stored in a text/image data storing section 13 and displayed on a screen. See col. 19, lines 55-56. A user may then speak or move while writing or pointing on the text/image data by using a writing device or pointing device, e.g., a pen. See col. 19, lines 57-58. Sound/pictures data and written/pointed to coordinate point data are concurrently stored in a write/point data storing section 11 by linking such data with a current time. See col. 19, lines 58-65.

Imai teaches that the write/point data is superimposed on the text/image data on a displaying section 8. When the user specifies a spot on the displaying section 8, a time corresponding to the selected spot is retrieved and sound/pictures data are partially played back based on that time. See col. 20, lines 4-9. In other words, Imai teaches a portion of a previously recorded presentation associated with a displayed input data may be played back only when the displayed, input data is specified/selected by a user (i.e., with a portion to an address).

Imai does not disclose "at least two ... processing apparatuses comprising meeting data reproducing apparatus" as Imai discloses either a standalone continuous data playback apparatus (embodiments 1-3 and 5-11) or a server based playback apparatus with multiple clients (embodiment 4). Neither apparatus discloses a plurality of processing apparatuses and at least two meeting data reproducing apparatuses.

Imai does not teach or suggest that a portion of the previously recorded presentation may be reproduced or played back by specifying at least one of a particular presenter, meeting participant and time as Imai discloses a user specifying an input event.

While Imai may arguably disclose more or less standalone input devices, e.g., pen input devices, or remote workstations to display data (fourth embodiment), Imai nonetheless

fails to disclose two meeting data reproducing apparatuses both having a conversion unit including a virtual machine, a communication interface unit, and a storage unit, both apparatuses reproducing meeting data in a task-distributed fashion.

Thus, Imai at least fails to disclose, teach, or suggest: (a) a virtual machine; (b) at least two ... processing apparatuses comprising meeting data reproducing apparatus; and (c) a portion of the previously recorded presentation may be reproduced or played back by specifying at least one of a particular presenter, meeting participant and time.

Wu fails to make up for these deficiencies of Imai. The Office Action alleges it would have been obvious to combine the disclosure of Wu to the disclosure of Imai because virtual machine conversion allows for a simpler implementation of data conversion, without added overhead and using minimum resources because the virtual machine creates a platform independent interface.

However, Wu is directed to object rendering on systems involving heterogeneous computing devices with limited computational ability, e.g., TV set top boxes, handheld devices, etc. (col. 1, lines 34-37). As discussed, Imai discloses either a standalone record and playback device or a single-server based system. Imai is at best directed to a homogenous set of workstations communicating with a server (embodiment 4) running the same application program. As the workstations of Imai run the same application program, there is no need for a virtual machine to perform format conversions. Thus, to add the disclosure of Wu to the disclosure of Imai would make the invention disclosed by Imai unsuitable for its use intended in violation of MPEP §2143.01(V). Further, the alleged motivation to combine Imai and Wu cited in the Office Action is without support of either reference. Because adding a virtual-machine to the disclosure of Imai would add programming layers, it would require additional processing to get anything done, not less, needlessly increasing the amount of processing, not simplifying it. Neither Imai nor Wu suggests that such a combination would simplify

implementation. As adding the disclosure of Wu to the disclosure of Imai would make Imai unsuitable for its intended use and the offered motivation to combine is without support, the combination is improper.

In view of the foregoing, even if Imai and Wu are impermissibly combined, Imai and Wu at least fail to disclose: at least two processing apparatuses each comprising a meeting data reproducing apparatus; reproducing a portion of meeting data by specifying at least one of a particular presenter, meeting participant and time; two meeting data reproducing apparatuses both including a conversion unit including a virtual machine, a communication unit, and a storage unit; or two such meeting data reproduction units reproducing meeting data in a task-distributed manner.

The Office Action rejects claim 2 by citing the same passages of Imai and Wu as for claim 1. Claim 2 is directed to a meeting system in which meeting data is generated whereas claim 1 is directed to a meeting system in which meeting data is reproduced. As claim 2 parallels claim 1 but recites at least one meeting data generating apparatus as opposed to claim 1's meeting data reproducing apparatus, claim 2 is patentable over Imai in view of Wu for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites.

The Office Action rejects claim 3 by citing the same passages of Imai as disclosing the features of claim 3 as are cited for the rejections of claims 1 and 2, and additionally alleges Imai discloses the recited communication interface unit. Claim 3 is directed to a meeting system in which meeting data is both generated and reproduced. As claim 3 recites the above discussed patentable features of claims 1 and 2, claim 3 is patentable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2, as well as for the additional features it recites.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-14 by alleging Imai in view of Wu discloses the recited information, reading information, reproducing information, requesting information,

and providing information recited in the claims. However, neither Imai or Wu disclose algorithms, let alone the programming or information recited in the claims.

Thus, regarding claim 11, Imai at least fails to disclose information for implementing a communication interface unit which allows said storage unit to be shared by other programming apparatuses via the transmission line; information for reproducing meeting data by a meeting data reproducing apparatus of each of the plurality of processing apparatus; and information for implementing said virtual machine to receive the supplied-data from another one of the plurality of processing apparatus.

Regarding claim 12, Imai at least fails to teach information for generating supplied-data in said common format, information for transmitting said generated supplied-data, information for reproducing meeting data by a meeting data reproducing apparatus, and information for implementing the virtual machine to receive the supplied-data from another one of the plurality of processing apparatus.

Regarding claim 13, Imai at least fails to disclose reading information for accessing at least one of said processing apparatuses, reproducing information for reproducing read-image data, information for generating supplied-data indicating a reading request and for converting said supplied-data into said common format, information for transmitting said converted supplied-data via the transmission line, information for reproducing meeting data by a meeting data reproducing apparatus, information for implementing said virtual machine to receive the supplied-data from another one of the plurality of processing apparatus, and information for converting supplied-data using said virtual machine in accordance with the received supplied-data.

Regarding claim 14, Imai fails to disclose requesting information for requesting a particular service to another processing apparatus, providing information for providing a particular service to another processing apparatus, information for generating supplied-data

indicating a request for said particular service and converting said supplied-data into said common format, information for transmitting said converted supplied-data to another processing apparatus via the transmission line, information for reproducing meeting data by a meeting data reproducing apparatus, information for implementing said virtual machine to receive the supplied-data from another one of the plurality of processing apparatus, information for receiving supplied-data indicating a request for a service from another processing apparatus in converting said supplied-data into a data format which allows said meeting data to reproduce, information for determining whether it is possible to provide said service in accordance with said converted supplied-data, and information for providing said service.

Wu fails to make up for all of the these deficiencies of Imai. As the combination of Imai and Wu does not teach the information features as discussed, claims 11-14 are patentable over Imai in view of Wu.

Claims 4-8, 15, and 17-24 are patentable for at least for the reasons their independent claims are patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17-24 are patentable over Imai in view of Wu. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Imai in view of Wu and U.S. Patent No. 5,894,306 to Ichimura.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Imai in view of Wu and Ichimura. The Office Action looks to Ichimura for teaching the use of a projector in a meeting data reproducing apparatus. This rejection is premised upon the presumption that the combination of Imai and Wu discloses all the features of claim 3. Because, as discussed above, the combination of Imai and Wu does not disclose all the features of claim 3, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9, 11-15, and 17-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/axl

Date: May 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|